

**From:** [Ron Gouquet](#)  
**To:** [Ron Gouquet](#)  
**Cc:** [McKenna, James \(Jim\)](#); [voster@anchorenv.com](mailto:voster@anchorenv.com); [erin.madden@gmail.com](mailto:erin.madden@gmail.com); [Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA](#); [rjw@nwnatural.com](mailto:rjw@nwnatural.com); [Lewis, Mark](#); [Koehl, Krista](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Final: Thursday meeting update and question  
**Date:** 04/05/2006 09:28 AM  
**Attachments:** [Lamprey and sturgeon suggested studies v1.0.doc](#)

---

Hi y'all:

This is a refined & updated version of the Lamprey & Sturgeon questions list we 'unofficially' provided a couple of weeks ago. Please remember: this is the 'pot' we've attempted to provide an exhaustive list of questions and approaches to help us know the 'universe'. A decision framework that strategically implements focussed investigations to resolve the questions is to be the goal of the lamprey/sturgeon summit very soon. Please review the attachment, which hopefully will serve to get lot's of ideas on the table.

Looking forward to talking tommorrow.

Ron

Ron Gouquet wrote:

> Hi y'all:

>

> Looks like a constructive format for Th's meeting will be free  
> disscussion & Q&A with LWG on how to potentially resolve lamprey &  
> sturgeon questions .

>

> Groundrule proposal: 'stipulate' that further discussions will need  
> to occur with all players and decisions will need to be made in some  
> envisioned future (soon) meeting; e.g., we may have a largish parking  
> lot..  
> We'll play it by ear if we want to continue with the remaining  
> 'potential partners' from LWG to continue the discussion, when Jim  
> drops off, but generally we maybe should shoot for about an hour & a  
> half to discuss the ideas & talk about how to approach an upcoming  
> Lamprey Sturgeon (framework?) summit?. Something like a schedule of  
> 0900-1030with LWG & continue from 10-12 with co-trustees, EPA OK, as  
> needed?

>

> Th 4/6/06 Non Participant

> Passcode: Non Responsive

> OK?

> Ron

>

> McKenna, James (Jim) wrote:

>

>> Hi Ron, I'm chiming in from Nevada where I'm attending a week-long  
>> class. I appreciate your concerns about the Thursday meeting. The  
>> LWG is responding to an invitation from the Trustees to attend this  
>> meeting, so if you feel the Trustees need more time we can be  
>> accommodating. However, just to be clear, the LWG is not coming to  
>> this meeting with hardened positions. It was our understanding that  
>> the Trustees, EPA and its partners, and the LWG would come to the  
>> meeting with open minds to discuss what we already know about  
>> lamprey, what we need to know, and options to get there. We are very  
>> interested to hear each parties views and ideas, and then take that  
>> information under consideration over the next few weeks in order to  
>> help develop a path forward.  
>> I am comfortable proceeding with your suggested meeting format. I  
>> will call in Thursday for the first hour. The logistics (e.g.,  
>> call-in number) should be coordinated with Valerie Thompson Oster.  
>> Thanks, Jim.

>>

>> -----Original Message-----

>> From: Ron Gouquet

>> To: Valerie Oster

>> CC: Erin Madden; Chip; McKenna, James (Jim); Bob Wyatt

>> Sent: Tue Apr 04 12:03:55 2006

>> Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question

>>

>> Valerie:

>> We really need the extra time. How about this, we schedule ~1 hour  
>> with LWG when Jim can call. If he has to drop off, fine. We won't be  
>> able to talk a long time, but just touching base is probably useful, as  
>> long as everyone realizes we are brainstorming. Is there a number  
>> (y'all's?) we can all use? We can do a 30min focussed presentation  
>> possibly as a peek at where the ideas are at this point on filling the  
>> information holes in our datasets. Y'all may want to drop off too so we  
>> can each chat among ourselves, while ideas are fresh in our minds -  
>> let's just try not to harden positions but think of possible resolutions  
>> for the question raised.

>>

>> OK?

>> Ron

>> Valerie Oster wrote:

>>

>> >Hi Ron,

>> >

>> >I have communicated with Jim McKenna and Bob Wyatt, and the LWG  
>> preference would be to keep the meeting as scheduled for April 6. Jim  
>> is comfortable with the Port being represented by others in his  
>> absense, and he will be calling in for about 30-60 minutes in the  
>> beginning of the day.

>> >

```
>> >Thanks,
>> >Valerie
>> >
>> >Valerie Thompson Oster
>> >Anchor Environmental, L.L.C
>> >6650 SW Redwood Lane, Suite 110
>> >Portland, OR 97224
>> >Phone: 503-670-1108 x19
>> >Fax: 503-670-1128
>> >
>> >This electronic message transmission contains information that is a
>> >confidential and/or privileged work product prepared in anticipation of
>> >litigation. The information is intended to be for the use of the
>> >individual
>> >or entity named above. If you are not the intended recipient, please be
>> >aware that any disclosure, copying, distribution or use of the
>> >contents of
>> >this information is prohibited. If you have received this electronic
>> >transmission in error, please notify us by electronic mail at
>> >voster@anchorenv.com.
>> >
>> >_____
>> >
>> >From: Ron Gouguet [mailto:Ron.Gouguet@noaa.gov]
>> >Sent: Tue 4/4/2006 9:50 AM
>> >To: Erin Madden; Chip; Valerie Oster; McKenna, James (Jim)
>> >Subject: Re: Thursday meeting update and question
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >Hi Valerie - Can you stand down for now on the Th date? Spoke to
>> >Erin &
>> >we want to find a time when Jim McKenna can participate in the next 2
>> >weeks. Can you check on that availability (with other LWG members?)
>> >I'll check with Rick @ COP. Thanks! Sorry for the confusion
>> >
>> >Unfortunately I just sent an email to Valerie Oster and Chip H.
>> >confirming
>> >the meeting on Thursday. I do not have time to attempt to
>> >re-schedule this
>> >today. I understand the concerns, but at this late date,
>> >rescheduling is
>> >going to be difficult. It took me five days to get calls back from Jim
>> >McKenna and get confirmation from Valerie Oster that five LWG
>> >members could
>> >make this meeting on Thursday. If someone is able to do it, I would
>> >start
>> >with Jim and Rick and find out their availability, then run those
>> >dates by
>> >us and EPA. Does someone have time to do that today?
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> >
>> > >
>> >
>> >
```